APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/772,986	01/31/2001	Hisao Hayashi	SON-2010	2637

7590   11/18/2005

RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER, P.L.L.C
Suite 501
1233 20th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036

EXAMINER
TRAN, THIEN F

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2811	

DATE MAILED: 11/18/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action	09/772,986	HAYASHI ET AL.
After the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit
	Thien F. Tran	2811

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

The reply filed <u>06 December 2004</u> is acknowledged.

1. ☒ The reply filed on or after the date of filing of an appeal brief, but prior to a final decision by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences, will <u>not</u> be entered because:

    a. ☒ The amendment is not limited to canceling claims (where the cancellation does not affect the scope of any other pending claims) or rewriting dependent claims into independent form (no limitation of a dependent claim can be excluded in rewriting that claim). See 37 CFR 41.33(b) and (c).

    b. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is not timely filed before the filing of an appeal brief. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(2).

2. ☐ The reply is not entered because it was not filed within the two month time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.39(b), 41.50(a)(2), or 41.50(b) (whichever is appropriate). Extensions of time under 37 CFR 1.136(a) are not available.

    Note: This paragraph is for a reply filed in response to one of the following: (a) an examiner's answer that includes a new ground of rejection (37 CFR 41.39(a)(2)); (b) a supplemental examiner's answer written in response to a remand by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences (37 CFR 41.50(a)(2)); or (c) a Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences decision that includes a new ground of rejection (37 CFR 41.50(b)).

3. ☐ The reply is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

4. ☒ Other: *The proposed amendment of claims 14 and 16 would raise a new issue of claim definiteness, 112, 2nd paragraph problem of having a broad range together with a narrow range. A broad range or limitation together with a narrow range or limitation that falls within the broad range or limitation (in the same claim) is considered indefinite, since the resulting claim does not clearly set forth the metes and bounds of the patent protection desired. Note the explanation given by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences in Ex parte Wu, 10 USPQ2d 2031, 2033 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1989), as to where broad language is followed by "such as" and then narrow language. The Board stated that this can render a claim indefinite by raising a question or doubt as to whether the feature introduced by such language is (a) merely exemplary of the remainder of the claim, and therefore not required, or (b) a required feature of the claims. Note also, for example, the decisions of Ex parte Steigewald, 131 USPQ 74 (Bd. App. 1961); Ex parte Hall, 83 USPQ 38 (Bd. App. 1948); and Ex parte Hasche, 86 USPQ 481 (Bd. App. 1949). In the present instance, claim 14 and claim 16 recite the broad recitation of a gate electrode having a thickness of less than 100nm and the gate insulating film having a thickness greater than 100 nm; and the claims also recite the thickness of the gate electrode being 90 nm and the thickness of the gate insulating film being 110 nm which is the narrower statement of the range/limitation.*

THIEN TRAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER